

★
COPY

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2) SS:
3 COUNTY OF WINNEBAGO)
4
5 IN THE MATTER OF THE)
6 UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL)
7 PROTECTION AGENCY PUBLIC)
8 MEETING FOR THE PAGEL'S)
9 PIT SUPERFUND SITE)

10 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS of the April
11 25, 1991, United States Environmental Protection
12 Agency Public Meeting for the Pagel's Pit Superfund
13 Site which was held at the Howard Johnson Convention
14 Center, 3909 11th Street, Rockford, Illinois,
15 beginning at 7:00 p.m.

16 APPEARANCES:

17 Gina Weber,
18 Community Relations Coordinator
19 U.S. EPA

20 Bernard J. Schorle
21 Remedial Project Manager
22 U.S. EPA

23 Paul Takacs
24 Project Manager
Illinois EPA

1 MS. WEBER: Good evening and welcome to the
2 Pagel's Pit site superfund public meeting. My name
3 is Gina Weber. And I'm with the U. S. Environmental
4 Protection Agency and I'm a community relations
5 coordinator.

6 With us tonight are Bernie Schorle who is
7 a remedial project manager with the U.S. EPA, and
8 Paul Takacs that is a project manager with the
9 Illinois EPA, Environmental Protection Agency.

10 I hope you picked up tonight's agenda
11 which is in the front. Tonight's agenda is
12 introduction by myself. Then Bernie will give a
13 presentation on what we found in the remedial
14 investigation. Then he will go on to the
15 feasibility study and the proposed plan. After his
16 presentation we will open up the floor for
17 questions, and after that we will take oral
18 comments.

19 The public comment period on the
20 feasibility study and proposed plan is the next step
21 in selecting a final remedial action or clean-up for
22 the Pagel's Pit. The comment period provides the
23 opportunity for local residents to provide their
24 thoughts and comments to the EPA on all the remedial

1 alternatives considered for the site. Based on
2 public comment or new information, EPA may modify
3 the preferred remedial alternative or clean-up or
4 choose another of the remedial alternatives
5 developed in the study.

6 Following the comment period EPA will
7 prepare what we call a Responsiveness Summary, which
8 is EPA's response to the public comments. EPA will
9 then sign a Record of Decision, which is a document
10 that outlines the clean-up action to be implemented
11 at the site. After that decision is made, then a
12 design for implementing the clean-up will be
13 prepared. And once that is completed, the clean-up
14 can begin.

15 I'd like to remind you that the comment
16 period ends May 16th, 1991. In the back of the
17 facts sheet that you picked up when you came in
18 there is a name and address of the person you may
19 mail these comments to. Tonight we can receive your
20 oral comments or written comments if you brought
21 those in. I'd like to also remind you that if you
22 didn't sign in at the beginning, to please do so if
23 you'd like to be included for future mailings on
24 this site.

1 And now Bernie will present -- will begin
2 his presentation.

3 MR. SCHORLE: The Pagel's Pit or Winnebago
4 Reclamation Landfill is located about five miles
5 south of Rockford on Lindenwood Road. It's just
6 south of Baxter Road. Imagine quite a few of you
7 are familiar with the site. Kilbuck Creek runs just
8 to the west of the site. And to the east of the
9 site is another superfund site, Acme Solvents.

10 Some of the features of the site itself,
11 there is an access road that runs essentially around
12 the whole waste disposal area. And it -- and then
13 this would be the waste disposal area in here
14 (indicating) where -- which if you drive by the
15 site, you can see by the elevated ground out there.

16 This (indicating) is the -- what was
17 intended to be an alcohol production plant that was
18 going to use landfill gas as a fuel source. But
19 about the time -- I understand about the time they
20 got this ready to go, the crude oil prices dropped
21 back down again, so they weren't -- it wasn't
22 economical to operate.

23 This plant over here (indicating) is
24 presently where they dry the sludge that they get

1 from the Rockford sanitary wastewater treatment
2 plant. Prior to 1985 they would take wet sludge and
3 put it in the landfill. Then when they put the gas
4 extraction wells in the landfill, they started
5 drying the sludge. This eliminates a lot of the
6 water that previously had gone into the landfill.

7 Out on this part of it (indicating) there
8 is chain link fence that limits the access to the
9 site and comes down off the road somewhat. And on a
10 lot of the rest of the site the topography out there
11 is such that there is limited access.

12 The landfill was constructed by grading
13 the area there to smooth it off and -- with gravel.
14 Then they put down the asphalt concrete base and
15 compacted that for an about two-inch thickness,
16 sealed that with a cationic coal tar sealer. Then
17 they placed sand upon the top of that. And this is
18 both in the base itself and up the side walls where
19 the wastes are below the surrounding elevation.

20 Then in on the bottom itself they placed
21 perforated pipe in the sand. There is some gravel
22 around the perforated pipe and this is for
23 collecting leachate. Perforated pipes are connected
24 to manholes that come up through the landfill and

1 they can put pumps down these manholes to extract
2 leachate from the landfill. They can also extract
3 leachate from the gas wells that are out there. And
4 they -- all this leachate is pumped to a small pond
5 that is on top of the landfill.

6 The pond itself has a plastic sheet down
7 for a base to minimize the amount that can
8 infiltrate into the landfill. Then that leachate is
9 periodically trucked over to the wastewater
10 treatment plant for treatment.

11 The gas wells, there are about 91 gas
12 wells now. They originally put gas wells in about
13 1980. Had about nine wells in. Then about 1985
14 they took those old wells out, put about 70 new
15 wells in. And then since then they have added about
16 21 more wells as they have filled further to the
17 west.

18 The -- during the remedial investigation
19 of the site some additional monitoring wells were
20 installed and that added to the monitoring wells
21 that were already out there. Over the years, as
22 different studies have been carried on at both the
23 Acme site and the Pagel's Pit site, there have been
24 monitoring wells installed.

1 The -- during the remedial investigation
2 there were essentially two phases of groundwater
3 studies. In the first phase a considerable number
4 of wells in both around the Acme site and the
5 Pagel's Pit site were sampled and analyzed. In the
6 second phase mostly just wells around the Pagel's
7 Pit site were sampled.

8 The groundwater flow out at the site is
9 nominally from the east to the west. The lines that
10 you see on here are what we call constant pressure
11 lines for the water table. And your groundwater
12 flow will, at those lines, will be perpendicular to
13 those lines. So you can see that, like down in this
14 area (indicating), that the groundwater flow is,
15 approximately, in this direction. Up in here
16 (indicating) it's a little bit toward the northeast.

17 So that means that any contamination from
18 either -- and this holds true all the way over to
19 the Acme Solvents study area, also. So any of the
20 contamination that generally is released in these
21 areas are going to flow generally toward the west.
22 Now, as you can see, over in here (indicating) there
23 is some curvature to these lines so that some of the
24 groundwater flow has got a southerly component.

1 The leachate was also sampled at the
2 site. And one of the things that was found on the
3 leachate was it had fairly high chloride content.
4 And the contractor that was doing the study for the
5 potentially responsible parties used that fact to
6 show where the leachate might be -- that might be
7 leaking from the landfill would be affecting the
8 groundwater.

9 And on this one you can see, this is from
10 round two sampling, and it shows chloride
11 concentrations at various wells. And then they have
12 plotted on here essentially constant concentration
13 lines for chloride in that area. You have a very
14 high chloride level in the groundwater up in here
15 (indicating). You have some additional increase in
16 chloride down in here (indicating).

17 Now in later rounds the chloride sampling
18 in the wells down in here (indicating) also showed
19 some increases. During this one sample round the
20 chloride concentration over here (indicating) was
21 raised, but in subsequent rounds that chloride
22 concentration did drop back down. Not to what we
23 would consider the background levels, but to at
24 least below what it was during this round of

1 sampling. Generally over in the Acme Solvents area
2 the chloride levels or not elevated very much.

3 This -- the other type of contamination
4 that you find out at the site are volatile organic
5 chemicals. What we're showing on here is a group of
6 those volatile organic chemicals called chlorinated
7 ethenes. There is about, I think, five or six
8 different compounds that fall into this class that
9 are found in the groundwater out there. We're
10 seeing some elevation of -- actually, when you talk
11 about chlorides in the groundwater, there is --
12 there will be generally a naturally occurring
13 chloride concentration in the groundwater. Usually
14 in most areas there will not be volatile organics in
15 the groundwater unless there is some source of
16 contamination.

17 Now so we're seeing the highest levels of
18 chlorinated ethenes over here by the Acme site, in
19 this area (indicating). And it's not plotted on
20 here, but there was another later study done at Acme
21 that found some up in this area (indicating). The
22 next highest levels of chlorinated ethenes are
23 generally in this area down in here in the southeast
24 corner (indicating). And there is some uncertainty

1 as to the source of the chlorinated ethenes that are
2 down here.

3 So for the purpose of what we're looking
4 at for the remedy at this time, we're not including
5 this corner. We're going to do some additional
6 studies down in this corner and then we will
7 undoubtedly have to do a remedy there because there
8 is contamination there. But what exactly we're
9 going to do with that corner we will decide at a
10 later time. There are lower levels of chlorinated
11 ethenes throughout a good part of the study area.
12 There is some up and all through this area
13 (indicating). There is even some down in this area
14 (indicating). Now the -- in the Acme study they
15 also did additional studies down in here
16 (indicating), but those weren't of concern for
17 this -- for the benefit of this study here.

18 At the site we also -- one of the things
19 we measured is what we call specific conductants.
20 It's really a measure of the mostly dissolved
21 materials that are present in the water. The higher
22 specific conductants is, the higher the dissolved
23 substances is. But these are all the -- not --
24 generally organic materials would not affect the

1 specific conductants. These are usually inorganic
2 materials that cause this.

3 We see around the landfill increased
4 levels of specific conductants essentially all the
5 way around the landfill, even out here (indicating)
6 where we're somewhat up -- we're upgradient of the
7 landfill. In other words, groundwater is flowing
8 this direction, but we're still seeing some
9 elevation of the specific conductants.

10 We have taken this, the data that we have
11 generated off of the remedial investigation, and
12 then in the feasibility study we have -- and this
13 work was all done by a contractor for the
14 potentially responsible parties with an oversight by
15 U. S. EPA and IEPA. And they looked at various
16 things that could be done to address the problems
17 out there, eliminate some of them as not being
18 practical or essentially being duplicates of some
19 others or very similar to some others so the results
20 would be similar, and came up with these
21 alternatives as possible solutions to the problem
22 out there.

23 Alternative one is one that the law
24 requires us to put in. It's what we call a no

1 action alternative. And under this one what we have
2 assumed is that, for some reason or other, the
3 landfill all of a sudden shuts down. They are no
4 longer operating out there.

5 We would at least get some cover onto the
6 last waste that had been put in there, but not much
7 else would be done beyond that. They would -- there
8 would be a discontinuation of the land -- of the
9 leachate extraction that is being done now. The
10 landfill gas also would not be used anymore. This
11 is a very highly unlikely thing to happen, but we
12 almost had to put it in because we have to have this
13 no action.

14 Actually, in this case no action is --
15 well, if you take a normal superfund site where
16 nothing is going on there at the present time, a no
17 action is really just continuation of the present
18 situation. This one is actually -- or no action
19 amounts to really going backwards because of the
20 elimination of some of the things that are being
21 done out there.

22 The second alternative is just the
23 planned closure of the landfill. It's the closure
24 that would have to be done according to their

1 operating permit at the present time. This would
2 include a placement of an Illinois sanitary landfill
3 cap.

4 Actually, they would improve the leachate
5 extraction system by placing permanent pumps in the
6 manholes and maybe some of the gas wells. And then
7 continuation of the taking of that leachate to the
8 wastewater treatment plant for treatment and
9 disposal. The continuation -- well, actually,
10 expansion of the gas extraction system because
11 presently in the western part where they're
12 presently placing waste, there are no gas wells and
13 they will eventually place gas wells there.

14 The finishing off of the landfill itself
15 will entail an increase in the elevation of the
16 landfill so that the -- some of the more recent gas
17 wells that were put in would have extensions put on
18 them so they would extend up to the top of the
19 landfill. Some of the older gas wells would be just
20 abandoned and replaced with new ones. But, anyway,
21 the entire waste boundary or the entire waste area
22 would have -- be equipped with gas wells for the
23 extraction of the landfill gas.

24 Then there would be some deed

1 restrictions placed on the -- with regard to future
2 uses of the property and the surrounding property so
3 that people would not be able to develop the land
4 right next to the landfill and consequently have
5 access to the groundwater that is contaminated.

6 Alternative three is essentially the same
7 thing as alternative two, except that here we would
8 have what we call a RCRA Subtitle C cap. It would
9 be a more impermeable cap than the one that is
10 called for with the sanitary landfill. It would
11 involve the use of a synthetic membrane in the cap.
12 It would be much thicker and, consequently, further
13 reduce the amount of water that could infiltrate the
14 landfill.

15 Alternative four is really alternative
16 two with the addition of a groundwater extraction
17 system. And the groundwater extraction system that
18 would be put in would entail the placement of wells
19 along the western boundary of the landfill. These
20 wells would be -- I mean this is just a general
21 outline of what this would be. The exact number and
22 placement of them will be -- would be decided later
23 in the design phase. But the purpose would be to
24 create, essentially, a wall along here through which

1 the contaminated groundwater would not pass.

2 The -- a well has a certain cone of
3 influence. And you would have an overlap of these
4 cones that would create this wall. And then the
5 water would be pumped over into this area and either
6 treated on site in some of the alternatives, or in
7 this alternative four water would be sent to the
8 wastewater treatment plant for treatment.

9 And, as I said, alternative four is in
10 other respects very similar to alternative two. The
11 leachate would be sent also over to the wastewater
12 treatment plant.

13 Now in alternatives five and 5A, they
14 would be similar to alternative four except that the
15 extracted groundwater would be treated on site with
16 carbon absorption. The carbon -- the groundwater
17 would be passed upward through vessels containing
18 activated carbon. The carbon would absorb the
19 organics and even a few of the inorganics.

20 Before the water was passed through the
21 carbon absorption vessels, it would be sent through
22 a sand filter to remove suspended solids. And, if
23 required for discharge, some of the water would also
24 receive some pretreatment for inorganics removal.

1 It would depend on what levels of inorganics we had
2 in the water. The -- now that is what alternative
3 five is.

4 Now alternative 5A would entail doing
5 this same type of treatment also for the leachate.
6 What we would do there is definitely the leachate
7 would have to be pretreated for inorganic removal.
8 It would also go through a sand filter. Then the
9 two streams would be combined and would be passed
10 through the carbon absorption system.

11 Alternative six and 6A are similar to
12 five and 5A except that now instead of using carbon
13 absorption, we're going to use air stripping for
14 removing the organic material. Again, if need be,
15 the water will be pretreated for inorganics removal.

16 Seven and 7A are similar to five and 5A
17 except that photolysis and oxidation treatment of
18 the water would be used. In this system you would
19 be passing the water through a vessel that would
20 have some ultraviolet lights in it. And this
21 enhances the actual oxidation of the organic
22 contaminants. It would also oxidize some of the
23 inorganics. You would add either -- or some
24 probably either hydrogen peroxide or ozone to the

1 water before it entered the vessel as a source of
2 oxygen for the oxidation.

3 Alternative eight is -- would be
4 different than most of the others in that this one
5 calls for fixation of the waste in the landfill.
6 Probably what would have to be done there is you
7 drill a hole into the landfill, pump in a reagent,
8 something that would react with the waste so that
9 after a time it would set up into a hard mass and
10 contaminants couldn't be leached out of this mass.
11 You would do this throughout the whole landfill.
12 You'd overlap these columns so that pretty much you
13 solidify the whole mass of the landfill. Now, also,
14 with this one we would still have groundwater
15 extraction with on-site treatment by air stripping.

16 Those are the alternatives that were
17 looked at during the studies and these are the
18 estimated costs of each one of those alternatives.
19 What we have here are -- for each one of the
20 alternatives there is a capital cost, which is just
21 the cost of installing the equipment or in the case
22 of a cap, the cap itself.

23 Then you have an annual operation and
24 maintenance cost. If you just have something like a

1 cap where you just have to maintain the cap and --
2 well, on this one you're also maintaining the
3 leachate extraction and includes the cost that the
4 wastewater treatment plant is going to charge you
5 for treating that material that you send over there.
6 Whereas, now like alternative five, the operation
7 and maintenance costs go up somewhat because you
8 have some on-site treatment involved of groundwater
9 and that may be a little bit more expensive than
10 sending it to somebody else.

11 Then we have what we call a present worth
12 cost. And this pretty much amounts to if I were
13 going to select one of the alternatives, and I
14 estimate, well, I'm going to have to do this
15 operation and maintenance cost for, say, the next 30
16 years; how much money would I have to put in the
17 bank today to cover those capital costs and those
18 operation and maintenance costs over the next 30
19 years period of time, making some assumptions about
20 the interest rates you're going to get on your money
21 and so forth.

22 So if you took 30 times 147,000 and added
23 it to this, say, in this case, it's not going to be
24 this amount of money because you're going to gain

1 some interest because you do tie up that money right
2 now. But what this does is it let's us get a
3 comparison among those different alternatives as to
4 what it would cost you to select one of those.

5 The -- we have selected really two of the
6 alternatives as what we call our preferred
7 alternatives at this point. And what we're
8 selecting is five or six. At the present time there
9 is not anything that you could say about either one
10 of those that would say that one of those should be
11 selected over the other. I mean five -- or one of
12 them involves carbon absorption for the water
13 treatment, the other calls for air stripping for the
14 water treatment.

15 It may be that by the time we get into
16 the design phase or hopefully when we get into the
17 design phase, that something will be there that will
18 say, well, this one is much better to use than the
19 other one. But we will leave that selection to be
20 done at the time of the design. In that case it
21 would probably be the nature of the organics that
22 predominate in the groundwater. It may be that you
23 won't be able to get the required treatment with one
24 that you have to have.

1 And one thing I did forget to mention, in
2 all of these on-site water treatments, what we're
3 talking about is once the water is treated, it would
4 be discharged to Kilbuck Creek. The -- for that
5 discharge we would need what we call an NPDES
6 permit. I can't even remember what NPDES stands for
7 but -- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination
8 System, I guess. But, anyway, anytime you discharge
9 a stream like that to a waterway, you have to have
10 one of these permits. And that permit would say
11 that you need -- or the levels of contamination of
12 the water could not exceed certain amounts. And
13 this would be administered by the state. The water
14 would be according to the terms of the permit.

15 The permit would require the water be
16 analyzed -- or samples be taken of the water at
17 certain intervals and then analyzed to make sure it
18 is meeting that permit or the permit requirements.
19 And that would also be the things that would tell
20 you whether you needed some inorganic pretreatment
21 on these alternatives.

22 So alternative five has a present worth
23 cost of, approximately, 11 million dollars.
24 Alternative six is, approximately, ten million

1 dollars. These cost figures are very rough at this
2 point. Generally we're talking something in the
3 neighborhood of usually plus or minus 30 percent on
4 most of these cost figures. That is pretty much all
5 I've got to say about the site.

6 I did skip over one thing in going
7 through this. The primary risks that we found out
8 at the site were associated with the possible future
9 use of the groundwater as a water supply. If
10 somebody were to put a well either near the landfill
11 on the west side so they'd be taking some of the
12 water, the groundwater that is flowing away from the
13 landfill, or if eventually that plume of
14 contamination were to continue on to the west and
15 intercept the nearest well over towards the west,
16 there would be unacceptable risks, as far as what we
17 could determine, associated with using that
18 groundwater.

19 What we're looking there is you would use
20 it for your drinking water so there would be a --
21 can't think of the word. Anyway, actually
22 associated -- or it would receive contamination in
23 your body because you were drinking the water or
24 using it in your food. There is also using it for

1 showers which would be an inhalation. You would
2 receive contamination through inhalation or
3 absorption on your skin. The other one is
4 ingestion.

5 And what we found were there was a cancer
6 risk of what we calculated of ten to the minus
7 three. What this means is that you would expect one
8 additional cancer case per thousand people exposed
9 to that. And most of this was associated with one
10 of the organic materials in the groundwater and also
11 with the arsenic in the groundwater.

12 We also found that there was -- that that
13 ten to the minus three, as compared to what EPA will
14 generally look at as the target risk range of ten to
15 the minus four or ten to the minus six, in other
16 words one per 10,000 to one per million, the --
17 there was also another health risk associated with
18 some of the other chemicals in there. Which showed
19 up as a health index, which is a number calculated
20 to reflect these things, of five if you didn't
21 include the cobalt. There EPA is looking generally
22 at a health index of one as being acceptable. These
23 are health affects that are -- that cause other
24 problems than cancer.

1 That's about all I have in regard to
2 summary of the studies that have been done out
3 there. I would like to add one thing to what Gina
4 mentioned before. During this comment period,
5 besides commenting on the proposed plan, if you have
6 any comments either on the feasibility study or the
7 remedial investigation report, we would like to hear
8 those, too. And we would address those in the
9 Responsiveness Summary.

10 Copies of the feasibility study and the
11 remedial investigation report are in the library
12 which is the depository for this site. Those
13 documents are located, I guess it's -- I think it's
14 the reference desk. It's on the second floor of the
15 library.

16 MS. WEBER: As Bernie mentioned, you can find a
17 detailed presentation. The documents detailing his
18 presentation are in the Rockford Public Library.
19 And, in addition, the facts sheet provides a
20 somewhat shorter version of all those documents so
21 this is something that would help you with
22 understanding the remedial investigation and
23 proposed plan. At this time I'd like to open the
24 floor for any questions.

1 THE PUBLIC: I represent the Rockford Ski Club
2 and we are directly across the street from Pagel's
3 Pit on Lindenwood Road. I did attend an EPA meeting
4 approximately four years ago and at that time the
5 main subject was pollution from Acme Solvents, and
6 now you have not mentioned Acme a great deal and
7 you're talking about Pagel.

8 My question is: Is Acme pretty much
9 cleaned up? And I do realize that they have trucked
10 a great deal of material out of Acme. And now is
11 Pagel the primary problem that we have out in that
12 area? And let me -- another question. Is there any
13 time frame on possible clean-up? Now our water, we
14 have a well there, and our water is contaminated. I
15 realize that you have many alternatives in what
16 you're going to do at Pagel. Is there any time
17 frame on when we can expect to be able to drink our
18 water, say? That's all.

19 MR. SCHORLE: The -- there was a meeting
20 similar to this last October in regard to the Acme
21 Solvents site. They had put out a proposed plan at
22 that time. And since that time they have written a
23 Record of Decision which states what they have
24 selected to do with regard to the contamination from

1 that site. That site is not cleaned up at this
2 time. And they presently are --

3 THE PUBLIC: They have done some work.

4 MR. SCHORLE: Well, they did some work. There
5 was some work done several years ago which was not
6 in agreement with the previous Record of Decision
7 that was put out. And was done essentially by the
8 potentially responsible parties at that time on
9 their own because they didn't like the decision that
10 had been made with regard to the clean-up that
11 was -- that EPA wanted to do at that site. They
12 actually did not quite finish the work, plus they --
13 really all they attacked was primarily the soil
14 contamination at that time. They did not do
15 anything with regard to the groundwater
16 contamination.

17 Now, the -- I'm not the RPM on the Acme
18 Solvents site and I'm not involved at all in the
19 negotiations. Generally, my understanding of what
20 is going to be done over there is there will be some
21 further clean-up of the soils at the site itself.
22 There is going to be some what they refer to as
23 vapor extraction where they will actually extract --
24 try to extract some of the volatile contaminants out

1 of the ground in order to get them out a little
2 quicker.

3 There is going to be some groundwater
4 extraction -- or some groundwater extraction wells
5 installed in order to try to clean-up the plume of
6 contamination that is over there. Where those are,
7 I don't know for sure. They are looking at what
8 areas they feel are contaminated to the point of
9 where the risks are unacceptable. Generally, I --
10 what I thought I'd seen at one time was some of the
11 contamination that is going in essentially a
12 southwesterly direction from the Acme Solvent site.

13 I don't -- the thing that -- I don't
14 remember the ski club's well ever being mentioned.
15 And I don't know that if it was ever even sampled.

16 THE PUBLIC: Yes, they have sampled our water.
17 And, what I understand, that we are on the extreme
18 north of the polluted area.

19 MR. SCHORLE: Okay, yeah.

20 THE PUBLIC: Now Mr. Winkquist, who is the
21 farmer just north of us, his water is okay.

22 MR. SCHORLE: Yeah, okay. I'm not exactly sure
23 what they're doing up in that direction. Now one of
24 the things, there are about five or six homes along

1 Lindenwood Road there that have activated carbon
2 treatment units that have been put in there by the
3 Acme Solvents potentially responsible parties. And
4 this was done before the most recent studies were
5 done. The plan is to get rid of these by installing
6 a permanent water supply for those homes.

7 And one of the proposals is the Winnebago
8 Reclamation Landfill well or the alcohol plant well
9 that is at the corner of Lindenwood and Baxter Road
10 would be used -- because that is a deep well --
11 would be used as a water supply source. But this
12 would be handled through the Acme PRPs. It would be
13 up to them to make all the arrangements that would
14 be necessary with the Winnebago Reclamation people.

15 Other alternative would be to install
16 their own well in order to supply these homes. But
17 the idea is to eliminate the home carbon treatment
18 units because they require certain amounts of
19 maintenance and I guess some uncertainty, too.

20 But that is pretty much where the Acme
21 Solvents work stands right now. And the reason I
22 haven't mentioned too much about that is that what
23 we're interested in really is what we have
24 determined as being the contamination on the Pagel's

1 Pit site and what we're going to do about that as
2 opposed to what is going to be done in the rest of
3 the area. I mean there is a certain amount of
4 uncertainty of separating these things, but we try
5 to do the best that we can in regard to that.

6 THE PUBLIC: Michael McGreevy. Excuse me. I'm
7 a member of the steward committee in the Acme
8 Solvents site. Addressing your last comments, you
9 talked about the permanent water supply. This is
10 Acme Solvents' committment.

11 MR. SCHORLE: Yeah.

12 THE PUBLIC: We also, by the proposed plan, we
13 see that Pagel Pit is causing contamination of well
14 water at residences. Why should not this be Pagel's
15 Pit's obligation as well?

16 MR. SCHORLE: That --

17 THE PUBLIC: Maybe it's joint and several
18 obligation?

19 MR. SCHORLE: I don't know that that -- as far
20 as I was able to determine out of the results of the
21 remedial investigation, that has not been
22 established at that point that the residential wells
23 are being contaminated by the Pagel's Pit site.

24 THE PUBLIC: Well, the proposed plan seems to

1 say so.

2 MR. SCHORLE: Not when I wrote it. I mean I
3 don't know what -- I'm not sure what part you're
4 referring to, but I don't know that that is the
5 case.

6 THE PUBLIC: Refers to the cobalt.

7 MR. SCHORLE: Well, there is one -- the cobalt
8 hit is a funny one. There was -- I haven't really
9 looked into it fully, but the cobalt only showed up
10 in one well. And I am not even sure which well it
11 was at the present time. But when they averaged it
12 into the -- to get their average concentration for
13 the groundwater that they were considering for their
14 risk assessment, the concentration was such, along
15 with the toxicity data, that it caused a very high
16 hazard index.

17 Now the thing about it is that the
18 contractor told me that if you -- based on -- well,
19 when they do a risk assessment, they make certain
20 assumptions about like the average human being
21 weighs so much, they'll ingest so much water a day
22 in drinking water and so forth. And if you take the
23 cobalt concentration that they had and these
24 ingestion figures, the cobalt ingestion was less

1 than the minimum daily requirement, and yet it gives
2 a very high hazard index. So that is -- that throws
3 some doubt onto the cobalt.

4 THE PUBLIC: Then there is the other aspects
5 which are in the proposed plan, makes reference to
6 the methane. You know where that's coming from.

7 MR. SCHORLE: Okay.

8 THE PUBLIC: And the sulfites. Those were all
9 things that were discovered in '81.

10 MR. SCHORLE: Ah --

11 THE PUBLIC: You wrote the proposed plan.

12 MR. SCHORLE: No. No. I know there is nothing
13 about sulfites in the proposed plan. The methane,
14 as far as methane, the methane, as far as we can
15 tell, is pretty much under control with those gas
16 wells operating. I mean there was a methane problem
17 back in 1980-81. But since that time there has been
18 a lot of gas wells installed at that landfill.

19 THE PUBLIC: Okay.

20 MS. WEBER: Any more questions? You may call
21 directly Bernie or --

22 MR. TAKACS: Paul Takacs.

23 MS. WEBER: -- and Paul to their office if you
24 have any questions. You don't have to have all your

1 questions tonight. So any time you feel like
2 talking to them or anybody at the Office of Public
3 Affairs, myself, or anybody, our phone numbers and
4 names are listed in the back of the facts sheet, you
5 may do so. If you don't have any questions --
6 Ma'am.

7 THE PUBLIC: I don't know if there is any --
8 that you can answer this. But what effect, if any,
9 is this going to have on completing the use of the
10 landfill and expansion of the landfill?

11 MR. SCHORLE: Okay. As far as finishing up the
12 filling the landfill to its permitted capacity,
13 we -- the proposed remedies involve not interfering
14 with that.

15 What we would -- the timing, with regard
16 to that, would be to get the groundwater extraction
17 system in as soon as we possibly could. This would
18 mean if -- assuming we go ahead and choose an
19 alternative that involves groundwater extraction.
20 And our timing right now, to try to make -- to get
21 this decision finalized, is before the end of June.

22 Then what we would do after that is go
23 into negotiations with some of the potentially
24 responsible parties for the site, try to reach an

1 agreement on having them do the remedial work out
2 there.

3 Once, if we were successful in that, then
4 what we would be looking for is going ahead and
5 putting in the groundwater extraction system as soon
6 as possible so that we could prevent further
7 migration of the contaminated groundwater.

8 But as far as the rest of the remedy, for
9 instance with regard to the installation of the cap,
10 that would be done as they filled up the landfill.
11 It wouldn't all be done at the very end of it
12 because when you're operating a landfill or
13 constructing a landfill, as you reach your
14 permits -- on your permit you're allowed to go to
15 certain elevations. As you reach those elevations
16 in a given area, then you have to put your final cap
17 on. So as they would fill it up in certain areas,
18 then they would install the cap.

19 The groundwater -- I mean the leachate
20 extraction systems operating now continue to operate
21 throughout this time. And after that -- the
22 landfill gas extraction system is operating now. It
23 also would continue to operate.

24 One thing I didn't mention with regard to

1 the landfill gas is that during the design phase,
2 with regard to that, they would look at whether
3 there would be a need for additional wells around
4 the perimeter of the site. This would pretty much
5 be dictated by whether there was any evidence of
6 some of the landfill gas was escaping from the
7 landfill.

8 THE PUBLIC: Does the supplemental permit that
9 they are asking for have to wait until they get that
10 groundwater in the southeast side?

11 MR. SCHORLE: That we have nothing to do with.

12 THE PUBLIC: You probably don't know anything
13 about that.

14 MR. SCHORLE: Yeah. Now as far as that study
15 down in the southeast corner, we will try to address
16 that as quickly as possible. And my own hope would
17 be that we could get that study done and make a
18 determination of what has to be done down there.
19 And particularly since it would appear that there
20 might be some groundwater extraction associated with
21 that, they would get that decided before we would go
22 on to the installation of the present groundwater
23 extraction or the anticipated groundwater extraction
24 system.

1 THE PUBLIC: You don't have any timetable on
2 that, when they might --

3 MR. SCHORLE: As far as the groundwater
4 extraction system goes, hopefully that could be
5 installed, say, within a couple of years. I mean by
6 the time you go through negotiations and get your
7 agreements and then go through a design on it, we
8 would have to look at -- I mean you're extracting
9 groundwater in different areas with different types
10 of or amounts of contamination, and you mix all this
11 together, these things have to be looked at. But
12 then now they anticipate having a life for that
13 landfill yet of something in the neighborhood of
14 five to seven years. So the rest of it would be
15 installed within that time frame.

16 THE PUBLIC: And the southeast study would be
17 done when this other is completed?

18 MR. SCHORLE: No. No. It will be done --

19 THE PUBLIC: You indicated it wasn't going to
20 be done, it wasn't included in this.

21 MR. SCHORLE: It is not included in this, but
22 hopefully within the next few months we could
23 initiate that study.

24 THE PUBLIC: That is what I was interested in.

1 THE PUBLIC: This sludge collection that is
2 going through there, does that have any metal in
3 it?

4 MR. SCHORLE: I guess you have to say yes
5 because I would imagine that any sewage treatment
6 plant sludge has some heavy metal. Now whether that
7 has enough that would prevent its use, say, as
8 application on a farm or anything like that, I have
9 no idea. But any plant -- sewage plant sludge is
10 going to have some heavy metal in it.

11 THE PUBLIC: What happens if that sludge is
12 used in a composting operation, composting land
13 wastes and so forth.

14 MR. SCHORLE: That is something that is
15 unrelated to this.

16 THE PUBLIC: Okay.

17 MR. SCHORLE: That is what I don't know. I
18 mean you could -- somebody could do an analysis on
19 that sewage plant sludge and see whether it could be
20 used on farm fields or anything like that. I mean I
21 know in Chicago the sanitary district was -- I guess
22 they were giving it away for a while there. Then
23 when the concern about the heavy metal came up, my
24 understanding is they discontinued it. However, I

1 believe Milwaukee is still --

2 THE PUBLIC: Still selling it.

3 MR. SCHORLE: -- selling it.

4 THE PUBLIC: Don't they describe it clearly is
5 not to be used on gardens or anything?

6 MR. SCHORLE: Vegetables, yeah. Yeah. But
7 that may be preventing lawsuits more than anything.
8 I don't know. I -- I don't know here. I haven't
9 really looked at any analysis. If -- the
10 feasibility study report does contain a report that
11 was put out, I think, in 1989 by the wastewater
12 treatment plant and I think it does have some
13 analysis on the sludge that they have. So if you
14 are interested in that, I guess you could get a copy
15 or see a copy maybe over at the wastewater treatment
16 plant or you can go over to the library and look at
17 the treatment study. It's one of the appendices in
18 the back.

19 THE PUBLIC: Again, I represent Rockford Ski
20 Club, and my question is that I understand that
21 Rockford Blacktop has purchased some additional land
22 both north and south of the Pagel's Pit for
23 additional expansion. And I just wondered if you
24 had any comments on that and what they planned to do

1 with it.

2 MR. SCHORLE: I really don't know. I know that
3 they have submitted a permit application for another
4 landfill south of there. I believe they do own land
5 going to the north, but I don't know -- I don't have
6 any idea what their plans are for that land. And
7 that's not part of their permit application, as far
8 as I know, for additional landfill.

9 THE PUBLIC: I understand that they have
10 purchased land north of Pagel all the way up to
11 Baxter and west of Lindenwood.

12 MR. SCHORLE: Yeah. That is my understanding,
13 too, yeah. But I have no idea what they're
14 planning.

15 THE PUBLIC: You don't know what they're going
16 to do with it?

17 MR. SCHORLE: No.

18 MR. TAKACS: I can tell you, I think, when
19 we're getting the questions of the expansion, that
20 is something Illinois EPA is going to have more
21 control over. I can tell you we got the application
22 for the expansion on April 12th. And we generally
23 have 30 days to give comments back. I'm on that.
24 So I think I could give you some indication as to

1 what is going to happen now coming up. But that is
2 something, you know, we're kind of handling
3 separately from this.

4 MS. WEBER: Any more questions? As I said, you
5 don't have to think of all the questions tonight.
6 You may call Paul or Bernie directly, or my office
7 and -- Chicago Office of Public Affairs. And we do
8 have an 800 number listed in the facts sheet.

9 At this time I'd like to open up the
10 floor for comments. And these are your personal
11 comments on the proposed plan, or as Bernie
12 mentioned, the remedial investigation or feasibility
13 study. You don't have to also give them tonight
14 orally, but you may write to us with your comments
15 and they should be postmarked by May 16th.

16 So anybody wishing to make a comment
17 tonight, please stand up, state your name and speak
18 clearly since we have a court reporter present to
19 take down those comments. Those are -- will be part
20 of the record of decision and they have to be
21 addressed in, what I had mentioned before, our
22 Responsiveness Summary.

23 Okay. If you don't have any comments,
24 then I will officially close the meeting, however we

1 will stay around to answer any questions you think
2 of and maybe chat. Thank you for coming. Good
3 night.

4 (Which were all the
5 proceedings had in this matter
6 at the time and place
7 aforesaid.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2) SS.
3 COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)

4 I, CONNIE L. MITCHELL, being first duly
5 sworn on oath, say that I am a Certified Shorthand
6 Reporter doing business in the City of Rockford,
7 County of Winnebago, Illinois; that I reported in
8 shorthand the proceedings of the United States
9 Environmental Protection Agency's Public Meeting for
10 the Pagel's Pit Superfund Site, and that the
11 foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my
12 shorthand notes so taken aforesaid and contains all
13 the proceedings given in said hearing.

14 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set
15 my hand and affixed my Notarial Seal this 12 day
16 of July, 1991.

17
18
19 Connie L. Mitchell
20 CONNIE L. MITCHELL
21 Certified Shorthand Reporter
22 Ill. License No. 084-001969

